

Ala told me in tears that her son's arrest led to no contact between him and his family for weeks, and they denied him a lawyer. After he was sentenced to 5 years in prison, she told Radio Liberty that she was proud of her son and that "he suffered so much for the sake of Belarus . . . The judicial system has steamrolled our family."

Lyutsina is the grandmother of the candidate's 3-year-old son Danil. I wanted to put this photo up because Lukashenko decided it was not enough to throw this boy's father into prison; he basically said he was going to remove this boy from the family as part of the punishment they were going to impose on him for running for President in that country. You see, not only did they arrest Sannikov, but they arrested his wife too. She was a journalist—automatically suspect in Belarus. Even more despicable, they tried to take custody of this little boy, who was staying with his grandmother. What kind of cruel mind is so afraid of the free expression of ideas that they would go after this little boy to further punish the parents—the father who had the nerve to run for President and the mother who had the nerve to publish in some underground publication an article critical of Lukashenko.

President Lukashenko's repression and totalitarian regime have been condemned around the world. Asset freezes and travel bans have been placed on his enablers and police state enforcers. This Senate and the European Parliament both have passed sweeping resolutions condemning the regime and calling for new legitimate elections and the release of all political prisoners. The families of the detained, the Senate, the European Parliament, and National Hockey League Hall of Famer Peter Stastny have called on the International Ice Hockey Federation to suspend its Belarus-hosted 2014 Ice Hockey Championship until all political prisoners are unconditionally released. A dictator such as Lukashenko should not be awarded the international prestige of an event while prisoners languish in prison for simply exercising their human rights. I think it is time for the International Criminal Court prosecutor to look into Lukashenko's regime, most notably for the allegations of torture.

I conclude by simply saying that I want Mr. Sannikov and his many brave colleagues in Belarus and their families to know that the United States will stand by them in their effort to bring a peaceful democracy to this great nation of Belarus. We commend their bravery and let them know they are not forgotten.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

#### OFFSHORE PRODUCTION AND SAFETY ACT OF 2011—MOTION TO PROCEED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 953, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to the bill (S. 953) to authorize the conduct of certain lease sales in the Outer Continental Shelf, to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to modify the requirements for exploration, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will be 4 hours of debate equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, we have been debating tax subsidies to the big oil companies. The bill proposed by the Senator from New Jersey would have limited it to just the big five oil companies even though many of the tax breaks or tax credits or deductions they receive are the same tax credits that every other company may take—Starbucks, Microsoft, Caterpillar, Google, and Hollywood film producers for example. Many of the other credits look a lot like the R&D tax credit or other tax credits all American businesses may receive. Well, I am one Senator who is very intrigued with the idea of looking at all of the tax breaks in the Tax Code. There are currently about \$1.2 trillion a year in what we call tax expenditures, and those are intended to be for tax breaks we think are desirable. I am ready to look at all of them and use the money to reduce the tax rate and/or reduce the Federal debt. But if we are going to talk about energy subsidies—tax subsidies—we ought to talk about all energy subsidies. Senator JOHN CORNYN of Texas has asked the Congressional Research Service to do just this. It is an excellent study, and I commend Senator CORNYN for asking for it. This is some of what it finds.

According to the report, fossil fuels contributed about 78 percent of our energy production in 2009 and received about 13 percent of the Federal tax support for energy. However, during that same time 10.6 percent of our energy production was from renewables and 77.4 percent of our energy tax subsidies went to renewables. So if we are to compare the subsidy per unit of energy, the estimated Federal support per million Btu's of fossil fuels was 4 cents, while support for renewables was \$1.97 per million Btu's.

So Federal subsidies for renewables are almost 50 times as great per unit of energy as Federal subsidies for fossil fuels. This would be distorted because included within renewables is hydroelectric power. Most people think of renewables as ethanol, solar, or wind and those are the renewables that actually get the subsidies while hydroelectric does not.

So at least 50 times as great per unit of energy is the Federal taxpayer support for renewable energy compared with fossil fuel energy. So why aren't we including in our debate subsidies for all renewables? Specifically, if we are talking about Big Oil, why don't we talk about Big Wind? The Senate seems an appropriate place to talk about Big Wind.

The Energy Policy Act of 1992 created what is called the production tax credit for energy produced using renewable resources. Most of this money has gone to subsidize Big Wind. It is a policy that was supposed to last a few years. It has lasted two decades.

Today, the production tax credit for wind gives 2.1 cents for every kilowatt hour of wind electricity produced by a wind turbine during the first 10 years of operation. Let's put this into a context that is current. The new Shepherd's Flat Wind Farm in Oregon will have 338 of these huge wind turbines, producing enough power to run approximately 250,000 homes and will cost the American taxpayer about \$57 million a year in subsidies for that electricity produced. If we allocated the tax credit per home, taxpayers will be paying \$2,300 over the next 10 years for each of the homes served by the Shepherd's Flat Wind Farm in Oregon.

This doesn't even take into account the fact that \$1.3 billion in Federal loan guarantees to this project means Big Wind will have its risk of default also financed by the taxpayer. Fossil fuel companies don't have that advantage. Nuclear power companies don't have that advantage, even though their electricity is completely clean—no sulfur, no nitrogen, no mercury, no carbon. If, like nuclear or fossil loan guarantees do, the wind farm in Oregon had to pay the risk of default up front as a fee, it would cost another \$130 million. That is money out of the pockets of taxpayers.

The total cost of the wind production tax credit over the next 10 years will cost the American taxpayers more than \$26 billion. Let me say that again. American taxpayers are subsidizing big wind over the next 10 years by more than \$26 billion with one tax credit. In fact, the tax breaks for the five big oil companies we have been debating on the Senate floor this week actually cost less than all of the money we give to big wind. The tax breaks for the five big oil companies amount to about \$21 billion over 10 years.

According to the Energy Information Administration in 2007, big wind received an \$18.82 subsidy per megawatt hour—25 times as much per megawatt hour as subsidies for all other forms of electricity combined. But wind is about the least efficient means of energy production we have. It accounts for just about 2 percent of our electricity. It is available only when the wind blows, which is about one-third of the time. The Tennessee Valley Authority says it is reliable even less than that, meaning we can have it when we need it only about 12–15 percent of the time.